

**BUDGET COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Budget Committee was held at the William H. Rogers Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium on Tuesday, **July 30, 2002** at 1:30.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Chair
Legislator David Bishop, Vice-Chair
Legislator Andrew Crecca
Legislator Jon Cooper

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Sabatino, Jr., Counsel to the Legislature
Fred Pollert, Director, Budget Review Office
Jim Spero, Budget Review Office
Linda Burkhardt, Legislative Aide to Presiding Officer Tonna
Ken Weiss, Director, Budget Office
Robert Bortzfield, Budget Office
Bill Faulk, IR/County Executive's office
Bill Jones, SC Department of Social Services
Anne Martin, SC Probation Department

Minutes Taken By:
Kimberly Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Welcome to the Budget Committee. Legislator Crecca is present, Legislator Bishop is in route, and Legislator Cooper has an excused absence.

Bill Jones. Bill, if you would be kind enough to make a brief presentation to the committee with regard to the correspondence that was generated to Commission Hickey and which you were gracious enough to drop off, which I thank you for. Maybe give us a quick summary of, you know, what the issues and the task force and so far what the recommendations and the direction we are going with respect to the task force recommendations and findings.

MR. JONES:

Yes, I will be happy to do that. Anne Martin, also, Deputy Director of the Probation Department, is here today. She is just making a copy of what was sent to you, Legislator Caracciolo. When she returns we can go over it.

I just want to say first the reason that Commissioner Hickey is not here, in fact, is because –

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Just give me a minute, Bill. I should really make copies for the members of the committee. And if there is a representative here from the County Executive Office, would they make certain that Mr. Weiss is in route? I told him when he arrived earlier that we would be conducting this Budget meeting at 2:30 instead of 1:30, which he was very happy about, but it is now 2:35, and I would appreciate if someone would summon him to the meeting. Okay, Bill. Thank you.

MR. JONES:

First, I would like to say that Commissioner Hickey had intended to be here, but he had a meeting set up on this very issue with some State representatives from the Office of Mental Health at the State level. He had written to Commissioner Stone with regard to the issue of residential treatment facilities, which we feel that there are inadequate number of allocations for the Nassau/Suffolk region. So, in fact – and we had had a representative earlier at one of our strike force meetings on that specific issue, and this is a follow-up meeting that he is having in an attempt to secure additional beds for some of our young people in the County.

This was all driven, as you know, by the rising cost of institutional care. And as it was explained this morning at the Finance Committee, there are basically two sources of where children come into the system, who come under the care and custody of the Commissioner of Social Services, and that is one, through Child Protective Services and through the reports generated thereof, because of abuse or neglect, and the other through the Probation Department.

What we sent to you, Legislator Caracciolo, is some of the answers to the questions that you addressed to us. Back in June we had submitted a series of answers to questions that had been presented to us by the Social Services Committee concerned the strike force that was created. It was evident in the year 2001 that institutional placement costs were rising dramatically in the County. To some degree on the Social Services side it seemed like the number of children that were coming through the system through the Probation or JD PINS side was even increasing more dramatically. And as explained by Anne Martin this morning, part of that has to do with the zero tolerance policy of not only Family Court Judges here in Suffolk County, but probably across the United States as well.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

As you said in your response to that inquiry, the get tough policy of Family Court Justices.

MR. JONES:

Correct. So, based on that we had started exploring some of the whys and wherefores of this particular increase of children going into or coming into our system and going into higher levels of care at ever increasing costs for those additional services and levels of care that these children were being sent to and what in many cases they were in need of. And we had been working along with the County Executive Office to try to explore some of the reasons. Then following that, a joint effort by the County Executive and the Legislature created an institutional care/foster care strike force to attempt to bring the parties together at the table, all of those that would be involved in the system, to attempt to come up with some possible recommendations in areas that we might be able to proceed.

Where we are with the strike force at this present time is we are in the midst of finalizing the

draft report for the committee members. As a matter of fact, either today or tomorrow that will be completed. We will have a follow-up meeting with the members of the strike force. It will be sent out to them for their review and then we will probably have one more meeting where that document will be reviewed and okayed by the members of the strike force along with exploring other options and recommendations that members of the task force might have with regard to holding down some of these costs and implementing some of the recommendations that have come to light during the course of both the committee and the things that the department was doing prior to the creation of the strike force.

So, question number one – you have ten questions here. I think that, you know, if you want I can run quickly through them, or if there is specific questions with regard to the ten questions I would be happy to briefly describe some of those. I am sure that number six, will you be within your budget, is a critical question for this particular year. We are hopeful. We have a budget amount for the year 2002 of approximately \$38 million for institutional care this year, and we are hoping that we will be within that budget line. As you are aware, there was a recent expansion effective July 1 of the PINS population up to age 18. That will bring in a new population that we have not had before. The { Vere } Institute, which did the study, indicated that – they gave a range – Anne, what was that range of potential –

MS. MARTIN:

The range is from 100 to 150% increase over the last year attributed to the new group, the new cohort, in the 16 to 18 year old.

(Legislator Bishop entered the meeting at 2:42 p.m.)

MR. JONES:

We are hopeful that with that new population that there is language in that legislation where the judges are to consider exceptional circumstances or special circumstances for placement of those children in institutions, which are the high cost providers of care for that particular population.

Number seven. What are your projections for 2003. As indicated this morning at the Finance Committee, we have projected between the Probation children and Department of Social Services children a budget of approximately \$50.2 million for 2003.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Bill, if I can just interrupt you. If we go to attachment C, which indicates from 1996 to 2000 comparative statistics between Suffolk and the other large counties in the State, could you just summarize what this comparison chart would seem to indicate?

MR. JONES:

Yes. I think what it indicates is certainly in the numbers and the rate for 1,000 children that on the foster care side of the population we have remained relatively stable in terms of the number of children in foster care who ultimately end up being placed in an institution or a residential placement. We are talking – there are now in many cases have moved maybe three, four, five, six times. They may have entered our system and they were placed in a foster care home, and then for whatever reasons that foster care environment wasn't enough and they needed additional services. They may have then been placed in a therapeutic foster home, they may have been placed in an alternative institutional placement, which is a family that is trained to handle children who have behavioral problems, in some cases mental health problems, in some cases substance abuse problems.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Is it the AIP model that you are moving towards this issue?

MR. JONES:

That is correct. We have an AIP team and we have just created a second team. I believe that most of that new team has been hired. We may be one or two people away from having an additional team. What those AIP homes do is they allow us an additional level or intermediate level of care prior to actually having to place a child in an institution. Certainly that is our preference. These are caseworkers and these team members – what we are hoping is that we will be able to create an additional 25 AIP homes here in the County. We already have 25. This second team will allow us to create a second AIP team that hopefully will be able to take 25 to 30 children and either step down those children who may already be in a residential placement or at least keep children from going into a residential setting in the first place.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Let me point out that in Erie County in 1996 there were actually more total days in care, institutional care, for their clients than there is today, or at least as of 2000. I don't know if that trend has continued. Whereas here we have seen the complete opposite.

MR. JONES:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

What are they doing that is working versus besides the get tough policy of Family Court Judges requiring these institutional care placements. What are they doing to decrease their placements?

MR. JONES:

I think the point is, actually, you have to look at it from the standpoint that I think that they started out on the high end and probably realized, you know, earlier on that they had a problem that they needed to address as well, and whereas our numbers have in terms of care days have increased, we are still seeing, in terms of the rate per thousand, a relatively stable number with regard to our overall population of the number of children that we are actually placing in residential care. I am not sure that they are doing anything more than we are doing. They just had a higher base to begin with and brought it down from the 99,000 total days in care to 81,000 over that four year period of time.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. But as you pointed out, and I appreciate your candor, we really don't know. So what I would encourage is let's check with Erie, let's see if they are doing something that maybe we could use as a model to help us achieve similar results, if we are talking about, you know, identical situations, maybe we are not.

MR. JONES:

We will do that. And the other thing also to understand from where we are in Suffolk at this point in time, again, is we are seeing, as Anne indicated this morning, just in the numbers of children that are coming into the system through the courts and through Probation because, I mean, those numbers are dramatic in terms of the number of children that we see from over the last couple of years to this year and then what we are projecting for next year.

But as you note, there are a number steps, a couple of other things that we are doing, is we are

hoping to fund a couple of programs and expand them, such as the {VINS} Program, which began about three years ago, and we are hoping to expand that because – Violence Is No Alternative is the name of the program, and it is something that works in the schools where we actually through a contract agency have someone who works with the children, works with the school district, to try to, again, as a preventive measure from keeping children from actually getting to the point where they are either referred as a PINS child and eventually come into our system as a foster care child.

There are a number of steps that Probation is also taking, a of things that Anne can certainly expand upon is the Drug Court.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Juvenile Drug Court.

MR. JONES:

Juvenile Drug Court, the additional Probation Officers in several of the school districts. In addition, a day reporting program which we certainly hope and everyone hopes can get up and running by September, October. That would give the judges an additional alternative to actual placement, especially in light of the fact that they – a lot of the children are being sent to placement because of a technical violation of their probation.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

For the purposes of time, because we are backed up in terms of the committee schedule today, I will digest Mr. Hickey's reply to my inquiry, and at a subsequent date take them up in greater detail if that is necessary. But for the purposes of concluding what we started here today in terms of your presentation, let's just quickly focus on two or three of the questions that deal with the beans, if you will, of County Government, you know, counting beans as the Budget Review Office does so well, and focus in on your response to question four, which was how much will your recommendations save in 2002.

Then I would like to jump to question eight where we get back to the cost comparison issue as it has been reported by Newsday. Then finally – well, let's do those two and then we have the Budget Director coming up and we could discuss with him some of the other issues facing the County now that this has been identified as clearly a major component of a potential County deficit for this year. So, let's start with question four.

MR. JONES:

Question four is how much will your recommendations save in 2002. Probation has estimated because of those steps, the additional Probation Officers in the schools, because of the Juvenile Drug Court, because of the day reporting, again, depending on when it gets up and running, that we will avert 1.5 to \$1.6 million of cost this year. It is not to say that necessarily we are going to reduce our overall budgeted appropriation by that amount, and I am not sure we can be that optimistic at this moment in time. But clearly, I think we can avert an additional cost because of those initiatives.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

What effect, if any, will the early retirements in Probation have on meeting that goal?

MS. MARTIN:

At this point we expect about 53 of our employees to retire.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Out of how many?

MS. MARTIN:

Out of 430. A number, about ten, are supervisory or management level and the rest are Probation Officers, caseload bearing Probation Officers and so forth.

What we were able to do in the early spring and recent months is to really strengthen through grant initiatives, to really strengthen our Family Court operation, particularly our PINS Diversion, which is really critical, especially as we face a change in the legislation. We obtained grants for school based Probation Officers, enhanced services, a variety of different initiatives that were underway as we were beginning to gear up for this time. So the Family Court Division, gratefully, is in pretty good shape as of this point.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Will they be impacted by any of those early retirements?

MS. MARTIN:

There will not be – there will be certainly some Probation Officers who will be leaving the Family Court Division, and the Director, Mr. Iaria and I, have been planning with our operations team to manage covering and prioritizing those positions that we really need to keep in place, given that we just put in place a number of interventions and strategies to address this increase in cost at the place –

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I guess my concern, my focus would be that we don't lose sight of that initiative.

MS. MARTIN:

Exactly.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And as a result of a scarcity of personnel resources, abandon the goal that you obviously have embarked on here. But obviously with that many early retirements hit at once, what will the impact be on Probation outside of this particular program area?

MS. MARTIN:

We are losing some key supervisors, particularly in our Criminal Court Division. We will be consolidating certain operations. Caseloads may have to be compressed, consolidated. Some people may have to wait longer for Family Court services, things that are not an emergency. The filing of a petition at our intake operation, that person who is not an emergency case may have to wait longer, those kinds of decisions will have to be made in terms of prioritizing.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

In real terms, what are the impacts to the public and the clients and the people we represent?

MS. MARTIN:

I don't think I can answer that today, the public safety implication, but certainly we are going to do our best to prioritize. But, to lose 50 people is going to be difficult.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And how do we replace – with the law written the way it is, in terms of backfilling, the limitations placed and hopefully – I mean, with the expectation of trying to materialize some significant cost savings there would be limitations, would Probation be an exception?

MS. MARTIN:

We hope so. We met with the Budget Director early last week and talked about the direction we need to go in. We are planning – Mr. Iaria, our chief planner, and myself are in the process of developing a plan. This year it is going to be very difficult. Our expectation is that in 2003 we will be able to fill 20% or utilize 20% of the savings. For the rest of this year we are going to have to make the best arguments that we can possibly to fill certain key positions because especially in the area of residential care and juvenile detention, those are, as you know, very, very critical positions.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That is again, my concern. There seems to be competing conflicts here that may not enable us to carry out this initiative. Am I on to something or am I just, you know, saying something that you would disagree with?

MS. MARTIN:

I am not disagreeing with you at all. My focus has been and continues to be to maintain what we put into place in this family court operation, to strengthen what we are able to do to protect the community's safety and minimize the use of residential placement. We aggressively go after – we have a long history of going after special funding, grant funds, so that we can supplement what the County is able to give us. So, we thus far have put into place some good strategies. I really can't predict, I can't quantify what the impact is going to be when we lose those other people.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Let me say what I often times say from this horseshoe, and that is, if you meet with resistance to carry out what you believe are not only mandates but initiatives like this, that you bring it to the Legislature either individually, like a single Legislator, or collectively to a committee of the Legislature, like the Public Safety Committee or if it is appropriate the Budget or Finance Committee.

MS. MARTIN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So that we could attempt to use our influence to help you accomplish what we all have an obligation to do, and that is to provide for the public's health and safety first and foremost.

Bill, getting back to question four before we leave it. In terms of the hope or expectation, not expectation but the hope, the desire to achieve this cost savings this year. How speculative is that?

MR. JONES:

Well, as we negated here, if we keep 21 to 25 people in an AIP setting versus a residential setting, we estimating it can range anywhere from 1.1 to \$2.7 million annual savings, of which

25% we would probably realize this year. We could really realize that if we – there will be real savings there if, in fact, we get these AIP homes up and running and we are able to step down some of the children who are currently in placement and take them out of a placement setting maybe costing \$150,000 a year and bringing them back to a setting here in Suffolk County which the cost is considerably less. That is a real savings.

As more children come into the system, however, and we just avert the number of children or we hold steady the number of children that are currently in placements, then the number becomes a little bit more speculative in terms of actual savings or reductions – not savings, I think reductions is a better term for 2002.

There are a number of other things that we are looking at doing. One of the problems for us is that we send so many of our children upstate and out of state. As Anne indicated today, Probation uses facilities throughout the entire northeast and southern region out west as far as Minnesota. We use facilities in Colorado, we've used facilities in Oregon. I mean, there are just some facilities that they don't provide the services here in Suffolk County.

So the other tact that we have taken is we have brought in a couple of these providers, Kids Peace being one of our major providers, who are located in Pennsylvania and they also have facilities in New York State as well, to explore with them the possibility of creating additional residential placement resources right here in Suffolk County. That is a more difficult challenge because of the high cost of doing business in Suffolk County, but perhaps – and we have proposed some monies in the 2003 budget, that would allow us at least to begin to perhaps do an RFP where we could do more – have an agency do intensive case management on children who are coming into the system on a preventive basis to try to provide at least wraparound services here in the community that would keep them here rather than needing to send them either to a facility here in New York or out of state.

We also spoke with Family Service League. We also had a presentation by an organization known as ABS, Alternative Behavioral Services. They are out of Maryland. We are looking at those kinds of things as ways of also reducing the number of kids that we have to – and again, for us on the DSS side, our placement committee, we have a placement committee that meets on a weekly basis that reviews the cases that are brought to the committee by our caseworkers and their supervisors, that they have found that their current placement, whether it is a foster care setting or some setting that is now inadequate to meet the needs of that child, we now review those cases, which we have always done on a weekly basis. So we have some greater control over what happens with that child, always keeping in mind that in many cases that case record indicates that we have really relatively few options except to send them perhaps out of state to a very specialized facility that deals, for example, with fire starters or someone who has behavioral or mental health problems that just are not – we can't find a facility in New York that will actually take them.

The other thing is, as I mentioned what Commissioner Hickey is doing this afternoon, is meeting with representatives of the State Office of Mental Health to try to figure out a way of getting some additional beds. There are 600 OCFS beds available throughout the state, and we have in the Nassau/Suffolk region only – I'm sorry, OMH – only 28 of which are available in the Nassau/Suffolk region. We need them to open up additional beds, and that is one of the purposes of the meeting today.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. Let's go to question eight.

MR. JONES:

Newsday has reported that our cost increases are much more than other counties, and why have you contacted other counties to find out what they are doing. This information we received by actually contacting the five largest counties, or the other four including Suffolk for five, and overall as you will see, again, as you compare the total number of care days which relates to the last attachment as well, that we are not really sure exactly what Newsday, where they got their information, but we got this information not from the state but directly in talking with those particular counties. Again, the rate per thousand of children that we have in residential care hasn't changed much for us in Suffolk over the past years, and the total number of care days also is, as you can see by the chart –

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So you disagree with their –

MR. JONES:

With that assessment based on the numbers, yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Please keep the committee informed on a meeting to meeting basis since we will be going into the operating budget cycle beginning in September, so it will be important for us to know exactly what is going on on a regular basis now because obviously we have to address this increase in spending that is forthcoming.

MR. JONES:

If I could, just the last thing is that, again, it is the rising population, the rising CPS reports that we're receiving that is leading this increase along with – this is an important component as well – is that we are finding that the children coming into the system are younger than ever, and that their needs and problems are greater. Again, whether it is on our side and particularly on the court side, because of things like Columbine and other instances, that there really is a greater zero tolerance for any kind of violations and it is part of the overall complex issue. And the children, we did a, which I can bring back at some future time, but we did do an analysis of those cases that we currently have of the children in institutional care, some of which, by the way, have been there for several years because there is no other alternative.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay, Bill, that's good because we do have another committee that is backed up and I do want to get Ken Weiss up just quickly for a couple of quick questions.

MS. MARTIN:

Thank you.

MR. JONES:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

First, Ken, as you prepare to take your seat, let me take this opportunity to thank you for your

many years of dedicated and loyal service to County government and the residents of this County. I, for one, along with many I know I speak for, will miss your intelligence, wit I am not so sure about, and I look forward to maybe seeing you out there on the green pastures of Suffolk County that we call the greenways.

MR. WEISS:

I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Just quickly, Ken. During the Legislature's recess in the month of July, it has been reported that the County has a looming 70 plus million dollar budget deficit. One of the areas that is a major contributing factor is the one that we just had a brief discussion about. Besides that, could you just give us a quick synopsis of what other issues that have occurred since that news report and where we stand today?

MR. WEISS:

Let me take you back to the end of the first quarter. At the end of the first quarter Fred Pollert and myself reconciled our budget models and in anticipation of the meeting with the rating agencies, we had come up with certain assumptions and conclusions as to where we expected the 2002 and 2003 budget to be. Since that time, the budget process, which actually starts in April of each year when the County Executive sends his letter out to the departments asking for their request. We had received a budget request in June and we had our budget hearings the ends of June.

What I usually do at that time is I take the model that we have, the budget model, and I take the departmental budget request, in this case I only deal with the large program cost, the DSS program cost, the Health Department program cost. I also updated it to reflect the latest estimate that we have on sales tax from our consultant, Conoscenti and Associates, and I also adjusted for some other revenues that I've had somebody monitor. Some of the revenues that we have in the budget aren't materializing as we anticipated they would. So, I put all of those things together and looking forward to 2003, because 2002 I am hopeful that we can end 2002 maybe at a break even, slight surplus, slight deficit, but close to breaking even. The problem is in looking forward to 2003 there appears to be a budget gap of about \$73 million.

(Legislator Cooper entered the meeting at 3:10 p.m.)

Now, as we speak I have my budget staff doing the detailed analysis we need for the budget. That is a long, detailed process. We spend the entire month of July and the entire month of August on before we come up with our recommendations for the budget, which has to be submitted by September 20th. But based on the preliminary numbers we have, we are facing a \$73 million gap, primarily caused by two things. Social Services, besides the things that you just discussed with the department, Medicaid being the biggest problem, institutional foster care probably the second biggest program, but total Social Services expenses between the overage in 2002 projected and the budget request for 2003, it is \$43.5 million.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Is that up from the previous estimate of 37 ½ or something like that?

MR. WEISS:

The 37 ½ is for '03, and then there is an overage. Since we are looking at the 2003 budget, you have to look at the differences in 2002 and then add them to 2003.

The other problem is sales tax, while it is only –

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That is the expense side, and now you are going to address the revenue side.

MR. WEISS:

Yes. Sales tax, while it is coming in better than most people thought, it looks like we could be about \$7 million short this year, which – I mean, \$7 million is a lot of money, but on a percentage basis when we are talking about an adopted budget of \$862 million. So being \$7 million down is a lot less than one could assume looking at the stock market and some of the other economic factors.

But moving forward to 2003, the budget model, the long-term budget model that Fred and I had agreed upon had a 5% increase in sales tax projected out for the remaining years after 2002. So we had to adjust that. Now we are looking at projected growth in 2003 of 3.3% instead of 5%. So those two factors come up with approximately \$33 million combined. So if you take the revenue shortfall, the appropriation estimates being higher, that is how I came with the \$73 million. What is not reflected – well, there is a lot of things that are not reflected in that since we haven't done the budget yet. The early retirement program is not reflected in it. I mean, I know how many people filed, I get a report every day.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

How many?

MR. WEISS:

As of today 557.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And what will the positive financial impact be?

MR. WEISS:

The total annualized salaries of the people retiring as of what we know now is \$31,470,000. We are hoping to save 80% of that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

And the 80% is predicate on only 20% backfill.

MR. WEISS:

Right.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Next year.

MR. WEISS:

Next year.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So that would assume that there would be no back filling this year at all.

MR. WEISS:

The way we are looking at back filling this year, and I am meeting with every single department. I have met with maybe four or five departments, I have all the other ones scheduled. I am asking them to calculate the separation pay, termination, sick and vacation, to come up with an estimated dollar amount for that and to estimate the savings for those people being off the payroll. Some people actually left in June, though the vast majority are leaving at the end of August. Looking at a comparison of what those savings are compared to what the termination pay is, and if they have more savings than termination pay, then they will have money to fill positions this year.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So based on that estimate of 31 million less 20%, you would anticipate about a \$25 million cost savings?

MR. WEISS:

On a gross basis. You know, we haven't calculated federal and state aid in there yet, so it is going to be less. I am not sure how much less.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

How real is that given the needs that have to be met in terms of serving the public?

MR. WEISS:

Well, it is going to be difficult. Departments are going to have to not conduct business as usual.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

What does it mean to the average resident of Suffolk County if you have a need for a service and you call up and now you don't have a caseworker in DSS, you don't have personnel in other County offices and departments to meet routine inquiries or routine needs, the Health Department. I mean, I don't know what the break down is of the 557. What do retirements look like in the public safety area?

MR. WEISS:

Well, the police, remember, are excluded from.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I know that in terms of the early retirement. But I mean, year to date, have we seen the number pretty consistent with previous years?

MR. WEISS:

The big bubble with the Police Department was last year. That was the first year that the military credits were – the first time the police had the ability to buy military time. The retirements this year will probably be less than last year. And we have been scheduling classes. I mean, the Police Department, we had a class – we have a class right now. The class started with 110. I don't know how many are left, but I think there were very few dropouts. More than half of them were former New York City Police Officers.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Behind DSS, the Police Department is the second largest County expenditure – departmental

expenditure.

MR. WEISS:

Well, they are close. I am not sure who is higher now.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Well, maybe now they are getting ahead. In terms of what you would expect this year in the Police Department, in terms of year-to-date or year end expenditures, will they pretty much meet their budget?

MR. WEISS:

We haven't really focused much on the Police Department yet.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

I suggest you do.

MR. WEISS:

There is some missing information. We are still trying to get the accruals for the superior officers and the detectives that were settled. Under our model, though, we had anticipated expenses in the Police Department to increase, and we were looking at about a \$40 million budget gap in the police district. I mean, that is not part of that 70 –

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

That is what I was getting at. I mean, I was aware of that, but obviously you weren't sharing that.

MR. WEISS:

I mean, nothing has changed in that. The \$73 million general fund gap is something that wasn't anticipated. The \$40 million gap in the police district was anticipated.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

So in total we are talking about something in excess of \$100 million.

MR. WEISS:

Right now, yeah.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Just two questions, and if the committee doesn't have any we'll conclude. We were waiting for Legislator Cooper and I am happy Jonathan, you were able to join us before we got to the agenda.

Fees. As part of this year's operating budget, it has been reported, and I didn't know about it until I read the reports, that two fees that were included in the omnibus resolution as revenues for this year, 2002, have not been implemented. One being the airport landing fees at Gabreski, and the other being the DMV increase in fees. Could you share with us why that situation has occurred?

MR. WEISS:

I don't know how much was put in the budget for the airport. I mean, it wasn't insignificant.

MR. POLLERT:

My recollection is that it was in excess of a million dollars. Actually, there is a third fee as well, which is wireless licensing fee is probably not going to be coming in for about \$2 million this year.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

In the aggregate how much – in the approved operating budget revenues have not been implemented, Fred.

MR. POLLERT:

Approximately four million dollars, I believe.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Ken, could you share with us why that's the case?

MR. WEISS:

Actually, I'll have to get some information for you. I know with the motor vehicle fee it had something to do with filing. My understanding is it wasn't filed properly with the state.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Counsel, do you know anything about filing? They are usually done by the Clerk of the Legislature.

MR. SABATINO:

The local law was filed with the Secretary of State, but that is an automatic thing that happens within about two weeks after the County Executive signs the bill, so, that wouldn't be the issue. I think what we have to do is somebody has to do – ten years ago when we did it, which was 1991, I think, when we did the first motor vehicle user fee, what happens is somebody has to contact the Motor Vehicle Department and just make them aware so they can process the paperwork. It is nothing to do with filing – I mean, the filing is important, but that happens just in the course of ordinary events. The Clerk's Office files local laws after they are signed by the County Executive, and a document has to be issued by the County Law Department to accompany that before it can be filed. But that, as far as I know, happened. I mean, I saw the certified copy.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay, Ken. If you could, you know, inform the committee in writing as to why those three fees were not enacted we would appreciate that. That will conclude today's discuss of this matter, but it will continue. When do you retire, Ken, and who will be your immediate successor or interment successor?

MR. WEISS:

Bob Bortzfield, stand up, Bob, is the Deputy Budget Director. My last day is August 30th.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All right. So you will have one more opportunity to address these issues with us. We look

forward to it. Stay well. Thanks, Ken.

We will go to today's agenda. Does everyone have a copy of the agenda?

TABLED RESOLUTIONS – PRIME

(P) 1196-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for the Vocational Education and Extension Board (VEEB). ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION. (Haley)

1196, do I hear a motion? Motion by Legislator Bishop, second by the Chair, to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1197-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopting Operating Budget appropriating funds for the Police Athletic League. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION. (Haley)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1198-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for the North Shore Youth Council. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND EDUCATION & YOUTH. (Haley)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1199-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating budget appropriating funds for the Nature Conservancy. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING. (Haley)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1200-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating budget appropriating funds for Mather Hospital Fortunato Breast Health Center. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HEALTH. (Haley)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1201-2002 Amending the 2002 Adopted Operating Budget appropriating funds for Lifeline Mediation Center. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES. (Haley)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1568-2002 Requiring child product recall notification at childcare facilities. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND HUMAN RESOURCES. (Crecca)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1587-2002 Amending the 2002 Operating Budget transferring funds for the New York State Fisher and Tackle Trade Association. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PARKS,

SPORTS & CULTURAL AFFAIRS. (Towle)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

(P) 1590-2002 Amending the 2002 Operating Budget and transferring positions from the Department of Public Works to the Police Department. ASSIGNED TO BUDGET AND PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION. (Postal)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 4/0/0/0)**

That concludes today's agenda. The committee stands adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.)

{ } Denotes Spelled Phonetically